

REMARKS

Claims 13-25 and 30-32 remain in the application after amendment herein. The claims have again been rejected under Section 102 based on Mayeul, or under Section 103 based on Mayeul in view of Xu (U.S. 6,738,390). Applicants have amended claim 13 to correct an error of apparent nature and request reconsideration of all rejections in view of the following remarks.

Claim 13 specifies a method which includes providing a network access device having three specific attributes, but the rejection does not cite any passage of Nayeul which identifies a network access device. As for the three recited features, the rejection cites passages which do not disclose all that is claimed. For example, the claimed network access device is

“(ii) capable of forwarding the first signaling message without performing conversion of the signaling message to an internal signaling protocol of the network access device ...”

while the rejection merely cites a passage of a patent claim (col. 13, lines 11-13) as though this language might exclude “performing conversion of the signaling message to an internal signaling protocol” but there is no support for such. As described at par. [0007] of the published application, in accord with the prior art, when signaling messages of varied protocols are received, it is known to first convert the signaling messages into internal signaling messages that conform to a general signaling protocol in a central communication device for ensuring a unified processing of the signaling messages. After the central processing of the signaling message, this would then be converted into a signaling message according to a signaling protocol of the target device. However, for an embodiment according to the invention, signaling messages are forwarded without conversion to another signaling protocol. That is, without conversion to another signaling protocol means that no conversion to an internal signaling protocol of the device used for the forwarding is carried out. There is no support for such an arrangement in the prior art.

Thus without performing any conversion to “an internal signaling protocol” the network access device according to claim 13 is both capable of forwarding the first signaling message

without conversion to a different one of the multiple protocols and capable of converting the first signaling message to a different one of the multiple protocols before forwarding.

Advantageously, the claimed arrangement is in recognition that conversion of signaling messages according to a signaling protocol into signaling messages according to another signaling protocol should only be carried out if this is also absolutely unavoidable. See par. 10 of the published application which further states that losses of data occur for many conversions, because a specific signaling message according to one signaling protocol cannot be converted into a signaling message with the same purpose according to the other signaling protocol. According to the method of claim 13, these transformation errors occur only for a portion of the signaling messages to be forwarded, since conversion is only carried out when unavoidably necessary.

Accordingly, claim 13 further requires:

“transferring the signaling message to the second device by tunneling the message through the network access device without performing conversion of the signaling message to any internal signaling protocol of the network access device.”

Another attribute of the network access device is that the first and second networks are connected via the network access device. For all of these reasons claim 13 and the claims which depend therefrom are allowable over the prior art. For similar reasons, the network access device of claim 30 is also allowable, as it requires: forwarding the signaling message from the first device without performing conversion of the signaling message to an internal signaling protocol of the network access device and ... forwarding the first signaling message without conversion to a different one of the multiple protocols.

The claimed method and device, which provide for setting up connections, are not disclosed in the application EP0926909A2. Applicants request reconsideration of the claims based in part on the noted distinctions, that each of the independent claims is directed to signaling messages and signaling protocols of the type which are used to set up connections. The rejection of dependent claims 20 and 22 under Section 103 should also be withdrawn for the

Serial No. 10/525,778

Atty. Doc. No. 2002P10504WOUS

same reasons, as the combination does not remedy the deficiencies noted in the Mayeul reference.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are now distinct and non-obvious over the prior art and allowance is requested.

Conclusion

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Jan. 29, 2009

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830